

Supplemental Material 4. Comments on the construction of the material: Experiment 2.

Two tenses were elicited: past perfective and past imperfective. Past imperfective is formed from the present stem (e.g., present: *treh-o*, past imperfective: *e-treh-a*). All verbs were regular in forming past perfective, with affixation of the aspectual marker *-s*—either on the present stem (e.g., present: *jela-o*, past perfective: *jela-s-a*) or on a stem allomorph (e.g., present: *treh-o*, past perfective: *e-trek-s-a*, or present: *kolimpa-o*, past perfective: *kolimpi-s-a*). The verbs did not belong to the same morphological class in the strict sense, although this was our initial intention. Nevertheless, we excluded irregular verbs, that is, forming past perfective without the aspectual marker. Nine videos were combined with a phrase prompting for past perfective tense and another nine with a phrase prompting for past imperfective. We did not use the same tense with all verbs. The reason was that past perfective and past imperfective were not equally natural with all verbs. As shown in Table 2 of the main article, most of the unaccusative verbs were combined with past perfective and most of the unergatives with past imperfective. A pilot study was performed, in order to establish which tense was more compatible with each verb. For a detailed description of the pilot study, the reader is referred to the study of Koukouloti and Stavrakaki (2014). It is noteworthy that the material is unbalanced, which is admittedly problematic, but it was the only way to secure unambiguous results that are not confounded by incompatibility between target verb and target tense.

Reference

- Koukouloti, V., & Stavrakaki, S. (2014). Producing and inflecting verbs with different argument structure: Evidence from Greek aphasic speakers. *Aphasiology*, 28(11), 1320–1349. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2014.919561>